

violence, that science speaks volumes about the real point of this bill.

By the way, if you are a patient, well, then, the message from this bill is even more clear and even more outrageous. This bill says the ideology of your boss, of your health insurance company, of your pharmacist, or your doctor is more important than your personal decision, your medical needs, or your well-being.

That is dangerous, it is wrong, and I will not stand for it. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Apparently, a woman has a right to control her own body unless her boss compels her to perform an abortion, and then she no longer has control over her own body—her boss does. And he can tell her: Perform this abortion against your faith, or I will fire you—and that is OK.

So choice seems to only go one way. If you choose to perform abortions, you are accepted in our culture. If you believe a child with 10 fingers and 10 toes and a beating heart and unique DNA and a functioning nervous system is actually a child, then you are an outlier, and your opinion doesn't count. The only thing that counts is you are compelled to take the life of more children and stand there and watch it. I think that is wrong.

No, this bill doesn't get into—as Senator MURPHY said, it doesn't get into speaking out about the violence against abortion clinics or, quite frankly, get into the violence on pregnancy resource centers that have been firebombed by pro-abortion folks, who have been spray-painted, who have threatened and attacked people who want to give sonograms to individuals who are pregnant. It doesn't deal with any of those because, quite frankly, that is a different committee. That is over in the Judiciary Committee.

This is a very narrow bill dealing with one simple topic. It doesn't deal with everything on abortion. It doesn't decrease abortions in America. It doesn't do anything like that. It is simple and straightforward. It says: Is this government going to compel people to violate their faith? Apparently, the answer today is yes from this body; we don't care what you believe. I think that is sad, and I think that shows how far we have moved as a nation when it used to be 92 to 1 that we would say: If you have a different opinion, that is OK in America. But now you can't have a different opinion. That is not right.

I would hope this body would speak out and say at some point that we respect all opinions in America and would speak out for the right of conscience for people of faith.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote start immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VOTE ON JOHNSON NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Johnson nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 392 Ex.]

#### YEAS—76

Baldwin	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Romney
Booker	Hoeven	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	Kelly	Schumer
Capito	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lujan	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Toomey
Cramer	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Ernst	Moran	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murphy	Wicker
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Graham	Ossoff	Young
Grassley	Padilla	
Hassan	Peters	

#### NAYS—20

Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Marshall	Shelby
Daines	Paul	Tuberville
Hagerty	Risch	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Cruz
Blunt	Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### JAMES M. INHOFE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany a bill (H.R. 7776) to provide for improvements to the riv-

ers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Schumer (for Manchin) amendment No. 6513 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), to provide for American energy security by improving the permitting process.

Schumer amendment No. 6515 (to amendment No. 6513), to add an effective date.

Schumer motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions. Schumer amendment No. 6516, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 6517 (to the instructions) amendment No. 6516), to modify the effective date.

Schumer Amendment No. 6518 (to amendment No. 6517), to modify the effective date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

H.R. 7776

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad that we, hopefully soon, will finally pass the National Defense Authorization Act and send this legislation to the President for his signature. Obviously, this has national, even global, implications, but I would like to spend just a moment to talk about what it means to my home State of Texas.

This year's NDAA supports a range of projects that will lead our military into the future, from nuclear modernization to next-generation weapons development.

It sends critical military assistance to Ukraine and makes a big investment in our national defense stockpile.

It focuses, appropriately, on long-term strategic competition with China, and it ensures our troops will have the tools, the training, and the resources they need to succeed in any conflict, and, of course, the ultimate goal is to make the United States military so strong that no country dares engage in a military conflict with us, and thus provides needed deterrents in order to maintain the peace.

The Defense Authorization Act shapes our military missions around the world, but it also is important for reasons that hit much closer to home.

The Defense Department is the largest employer in the United States, with 2.9 million employees, including both servicemembers and civilians. They are stationed in more than 160 different countries around the world, and on all seven continents. And, on any given day, they can be found providing life-saving medical care, maintaining aircraft, protecting communities in war zones, or carrying out various missions.

Texas is the proud home to 14 military installations which directly employ more than 235,000 people. When you add in construction, information technology, manufacturing, and the many other workers these facilities require, Texas military installations employ more than 620,000 people. The